

THE DAILY JOURNAL

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 1900.

Telephone Calls.

Business Office, 228; Editorial Rooms, 225.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.

DAILY BY MAIL.
Daily only, three months, \$2.70
Daily only, six months, \$5.00
Daily only, one year, \$9.00
Daily, including Sunday, one year, \$10.00
Sunday only, one year, \$2.00
When furnished by agents.

Daily, per copy, by carrier, 15 cts.
Daily, single copy, by mail, 5 cts.
Daily and Sunday, per week, by carrier, 25 cts.
Daily and Sunday, per week, by mail, 30 cts.

For year, by mail, \$10.00.

Reduced Rates to Clubs.

Subscribe with any of our numerous agents or send subscription to the

JOURNAL NEWSPAPER COMPANY,

Indianapolis, Ind.

Persons sending the Journal through the mails in the United States should put on an outside paper a ONE-CENT postage stamp, on a twelve cent postage stamp, on a twelve cent postage stamp. Foreign postage is usually double these rates.

All communications intended for publication in this paper must, in order to receive attention, be accompanied by the name and address of the writer. Rejected manuscripts will not be returned unless postage is indicated for that purpose.

THE INDIANAPOLIS JOURNAL

Can be found at the following places:

CHICAGO—Palmer House, P. O. News Co., 217 Dearborn street, Great Northern Hotel and Grand Pacific Hotel.

CINCINNATI—C. R. Hawley & Co., 154 Vine street.

LOUISVILLE—J. T. Dearing, northwest corner of Third and Jefferson streets, and Louisville Book Co., 25 Fourth avenue.

ST. LOUIS—Union Company, Union Depot.

WASHINGTON, D. C.—Riggs House, Ebbitt House and Willard's Hotel.

General Buller never crosses a river till he gets to it, but he gets to it pretty often.

It is not that Kentucky really has more Legislatures than other States, but they are in so many places at once.

It needs no legislative act to cause the people to remember that to-day, Feb. 12, is the anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln.

With the prospect of building a Nicaragua canal at a cost of over \$100,000,000, the proposition to expend \$75,000,000 for the purchase and improvement of the canals of New York is, at least, premature.

By refusing to compromise Governor Taylor has saved all his rights, including that of a popular election, and by deciding to fight the matter out in the Legislature, biased as it is, he will win popular sympathy and put the Republicans and anti-Goebel Democrats in good shape for the next election.

The indications are that the Reichstag will vote the money which Emperor William wishes for his new navy—\$192,000,000—to be expended in the course of ten years. A potential factor in the world's affairs now, Germany will be a leader under the policy of the Emperor, which means commercial expansion.

Military Expert Spencer Wilkinson now thinks that "Lord Roberts's strategy evidently is to act in the western theater of war with energy enough to move the center of gravity thither." It will strike most people, military experts or not, that the British need a strong lever carefully adjusted on a good fulcrum, with power enough applied to move the center of gravity in some direction, anyhow.

The so-called anti-trust meeting in Chicago this week is simply a Bryan jab-fest. Not only are Republicans not invited to speak, but the president of the Traveling Men's Association of New York, a Democratic organization, has been denied the privilege of speaking until his speech has been revised by ex-Governor Altgeld, simply because he favored the nomination of Judge Van Wyck.

It is not so much in the interest of peace that Joe Blackburn pleaded with Governor Taylor to recognize the Goebel regime by signing the agreement as that he personally desires that that official should recognize the existence and legality of the Democratic usurpation. He is anxious for such recognition because, when his credentials reach Washington, there is likely to be a painful inquiry into the regularity of Mr. Blackburn's credentials. If the Governor was fraudulently elected, why not the Legislature which has made Mr. Blackburn senator?

It is fair to say that Abraham Lincoln was a politician all his life. He took part in primaries and conventions because he had ideas that he believed to be essential to the Nation's welfare. He was a Whig until he helped to form the Republican party. He was a Republican until his death, and if he were now living he would be a Republican to-day for the reason he instinctively belonged to the element hostile to the Democracy. In the days of Jackson, when Democracy was most popular, he was anti-Jackson. He would be anti-Democratic now, when Democracy has become Bryanism.

The verdict of guilty in the Molinex case, in New York, is a severe application of the rule of law which imputes malicious intent to a murderous act, even though none is proven. In this case the poison which the defendant was charged with sending to one person, with felonious intent, was taken by another, against whom he had no malice whatever. In his charge the judge said: "If you find that Molinex sent the poison, he is just as guilty as if Cornish had died instead of Mrs. Adams."

The law takes a different view of murder from that taken by some people who handle murderous weapons.

The only plausible explanation of the third retirement of General Buller is that it was a feint to divert the attention of the Boers from the operations of Lord Roberts and prevent the sending of troops to oppose him. General Buller has not had at any time sufficient troops to turn so strong a position as that which confronts him. The movement which he made was attended with slight loss, and his force was withdrawn without being attacked or even followed. It seems that the attack of Buller has served to keep the large army of the Boers in his front and away from Roberts. If such was not the object of the last movement it can have no explanation that does not brand General Buller as the most inefficient man ever placed in command of an army.

When an Indiana hotel-keeper refuses to furnish entertainment to Booker Washington, or any other decently dressed colored citizen, he not only violates the laws of the land but displays a stupid prejudice which

has no place in this State. Booker Washington is one of the great men of the century, engaged in an earnest and unselfish effort to bring the people of his race to be a help rather than a hindrance to the country. All over the country, in the South as well as the North, he is honored by the most intelligent men. Now an Anderson hotel-keeper refuses him the entertainment which the law makes it a misdemeanor to refuse. No wonder the best people in Anderson resent the insult.

A DIPLOMATIC TRIUMPH FOR THE UNITED STATES.

The administration deserves a national vote of thanks for its admirable statement regarding the binding force of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty and the effect of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty modifying it. We say the administration because, although the statement comes from "a high official of the State Department," presumably the secretary of state, it is evidently intended to represent the views of the administration. It comes just in time to prevent mistaken statements from making an exhibition of itself by opposing the ratification of a new treaty intended to correct one of the most embarrassing diplomatic blunders the United States has ever made. A correct understanding of the facts and careful comparison of the operation of the old and the new treaty would have enabled our jingo statesmen to avoid a blunder of this kind, but some people would rather go wrong than take a little pains to be right, especially when going wrong affords an opportunity to make a bid for popularity and appeal to the galleries.

The statement made by authority of the State Department shows that the Clayton-Bulwer treaty of 1850 is still in full force and effect; that this fact has been recognized by every American secretary of state during the last fifty years except one, whose opposite contention had so little weight that "it was soon dropped and has never been renewed;" that even Mr. Blaine could find no ground for questioning the binding force of the treaty except "changed conditions," which ground was speedily abandoned; that it can only be got rid of by the joint action of the two contracting parties, and that if the new treaty is rejected we shall fall back on the old one with its ironclad provision against the building of the Nicaragua canal with other United States alone, and with other provisions which the State Department characterizes as having been "imperfectly comprehended, contradictorily interpreted and mutually vexatious." To keep alive such a treaty as this, with the added emphasis of rejecting one intended to supplant it and substitute advantages for its disadvantages, was what a little coterie of short-sighted statesmen were preparing to do by endeavoring to defeat the Hay-Pauncefote treaty. Let us hope that the timely statement of the State Department will enable them to see their duty differently.

There are one or two points in the case that will bear amplifying. In their anxiety to find some ground for criticizing the administration the opponents of the new treaty have declared that it is a diplomatic triumph for England and new evidence of an American-British alliance. In reality it is just the reverse. Under existing conditions the Clayton-Bulwer treaty is a continuing diplomatic triumph for Great Britain, and its abrogation would be a distinct American success. As it stands and has stood for fifty years it is an American-British alliance declaring that "neither the one nor the other will ever obtain or maintain for itself any exclusive control over" a ship canal across the isthmus. As long as this provision and others in the treaty stand the United States is barred from taking any independent action towards constructing or controlling the Nicaragua canal. The repeal of the treaty will end this embarrassing American-British agreement and give the United States a free hand.

The provisions in the new treaty guaranteeing the neutrality of the canal and obligating the United States not to maintain any fortifications upon it are simply a repetition of provisions in the existing treaty and so universally recognized that they might almost be called principles of international law. In the last year of the nineteenth century it goes without saying that any inter-oceanic waterway must be as free to the world as the ocean itself, and that beyond the legitimate regulation of its tolls and control of its business no nation shall be allowed to appropriate it. The guaranty for the neutrality and non-fortification of the canal has been contained in every treaty or concession ever made on the subject, and even if other governments should waive their international rights in this regard there is no reason to believe the Central American governments would. Under the Clayton-Bulwer treaty Great Britain would have an equal voice with the United States in fixing tolls and the conditions of traffic upon it, while under the new treaty she will have no voice whatever, everything pertaining to the management of the canal, except its neutrality in case of war, being under the exclusive control of the United States. In short, the new treaty is a decided diplomatic triumph for the United States, though evidently conceded by Great Britain, and the Senate should not hesitate a moment to ratify it.

STATUS OF THE ACQUIRED ISLANDS.

The proposition to admit the products of Puerto Rico and the Philippines to our ports has raised a question as to the scope of the Constitution and laws in reference to those acquisitions. One side assumes that the Constitution and the laws under it apply to any territory which is ceded to the United States. That would seem to be the logical inference, but it appears that the practice of the government has been different, the accumulated practice and experience and all recorded rulings of the courts upon which recorded rulings are based being to the effect that the establishment of sovereignty does not carry with it all constitutional guarantees like equal and uniform taxation.

The ordinance of 1787 was the first legislation by Congress for territory outside of the union of States. This ordinance denied constitutional guarantees to territories of the first-class and ruled them through federal appointees, without franchise or local legislation. It was not until January, 1805, eighteen years after the passage of the ordinance of 1787, that the freeholders of the territory of Indiana were authorized to elect representatives to a territorial legislature. Even then the legislative council and all the officers were finally by

the President or those in authority under him. It was not until this time that the people of the territory were permitted to elect a delegate to Congress. What is true of Indiana may be said to be true of all the territory outside the original States.

At that time there was no question of conformity of duties on imports, because the country had no ports, but that question arose in Louisiana in 1804 under the administration of Jefferson. That original expansionist had purchased the whole region without the consent of its people. From 1803 to 1811 the territory of Orleans was governed outside of constitutional guarantees, passing from military to civil. The Spanish administration and the French law were retained and executed by officers appointed by the President. The tariff under an agreement in the treaty with Napoleon, was different from that of the United States under the Constitution. Florida remained under military government for some time and paid duties on its goods shipped to our ports as did other territories. Alaska has remained over thirty years in the state of a colony, or like one of the territories of the first class, as was Indiana for years. In all these years Alaska has been governed by officers appointed by the United States, and whatever laws it has are such as have been extended over it by Congress. New Mexico has been under the sovereignty of the United States for half a century, but it has no constitutional guarantees similar to those of States.

It appears that the Supreme Court of the United States has sustained Congress in all its acts and omissions in regard to territories. In a recent address before the New York bar a lawyer named Gardner cited a number of decisions to the effect that "Congress has the same power over its public domain as over other property belonging to the United States," and that Congress may legislate in accordance with the specific needs of such locality and vary its regulations to meet the circumstances and conditions of the people." In a Florida case Chief Justice Taney held that imports from there must pay duties, although the land was in our possession. He also sustained the collection of duties on goods taken into the United States from conquered Mexican territory on the ground that no port in newly-acquired territory is domestic until made so by a specific act of Congress.

The precedents give the status of acquired territory in the past and seem a complete refutation of the claims of those persons in Washington who are declaring that the sovereignty of the United States carries all the guarantees of the Constitution and the acts of Congress.

THE BRITISH NAVY AND OTHERS.

The published statement regarding defects in the armament of the British navy will undoubtedly attract attention throughout the world, but it would not be safe to conclude that her navy is no longer formidable. Such defects as may be found to exist in the armament of any of her ships will doubtless be speedily remedied, and even without these ships the British navy is much stronger than that of any other nation. Including warships of all kinds she has more than twice as many as any other European power, carrying 1,600 heavy guns and 9,988 secondary and machine guns against France's 729 heavy and 4,249 secondary guns; Germany's 288 heavy and 1,469 secondary; Russia's 658 heavy and 4,208 secondary. None of these navies has been tested in actual war, so they are on an equality in that respect, while that of Great Britain greatly outclasses any of them on paper. The British have always been good sailors and naval fighters—better than the French in their palmiest days, and, of course, better than the Germans or Russians, both of whom have their naval records yet to make. Assuming that British seamanship has not deteriorated, the British navy could come near whipping the combined navies of Europe and would be more than a match for any naval combination that is ever likely to be made against her. Ship for ship and gun for gun she would doubtless be more than a match for the French, the Germans or the Prussians, none of whom possess the naval instinct or are at home on the ocean as the British are. Russia has a fine navy on paper, but the Russians are not sailors or sea-fighters, and it remains to be seen whether the German navy possesses any fighting qualities or not.

The only people in the world who have ever beaten Great Britain badly in naval conflicts, and from whom she has descended to learn new lessons in naval warfare, are the Americans. She has more respect for and fear of the American navy than for any other, and has borrowed more ideas of us than from all others combined. This sentiment has been pounded into her by repeated victories won by Americans in the naval engagements of two wars, in both of which not only our warships but our privateers demonstrated that Great Britain was far from being mistress of the seas. In the Revolutionary war our navy and privateers together captured or destroyed 76 British vessels, and in the war of 1812 they captured or destroyed 1,554. These exploits included some of the greatest naval battles recorded in history, resulting in American victories that astounded the British and no less than the rest of the world that had come to regard them as invincible at sea. In the second year of the Revolutionary war our ships pushed their operations so close to British waters that British merchants demanded escorts for their ships sailing from Ireland to England. "In no former war," said an English newspaper of the day, "not even in any of the wars with France and Spain, were the linen vessels from Ireland to England escorted by warships." In 1773 officials of the city of London testified before a parliamentary committee that "the losses suffered by British merchants in consequence of captures made by American vessels up to October, 1777, could not be short of \$11,000,000." When the war of 1812 was about to break out, a London newspaper, recalling the daring exploits of American ships in the previous war, said:

These are facts which can be traced to a period when America was in her infancy, without ships, without money, and at a time when our navy was not much less in strength than at present. The Americans will be found to be a different sort of enemy by sea than the French. They possess nautical knowledge, with equal enterprise to ourselves. They will be found attempting to do what which a Frenchman would never think of.

In both of these wars the rate of marine insurance in London rose from 20 to 50 per cent. In June, 1812, flour in Great Britain was \$58 a barrel, beef \$38, pork \$36, and lumber \$22 a thousand feet. Public meetings were held denouncing the impotence of the British navy to protect commerce. At one of these meetings an address was unanimously adopted declaring that "the audacity with which American privateers have approached our coasts, and the success with which their enterprise has been attended, have proved injurious to our commerce, humbling to our pride and discredit to the directors of the naval power of the British nation, whose flag till of late waved over every sea and triumphed over every rival." Every reader of history is familiar with the American naval victories in the year of 1812. In announcing one of them the London Times said: "The fact seems to be but too clearly established that the Americans have some superior mode of firing, and that we cannot be too anxiously employed in discerning to what circumstance that superiority is owing." Before the war of 1812 ended the British had adopted some important features of American shipbuilding and armament. In the introduction to a "History of the British Navy," published in 1828, the author, an Englishman, said: "It is but justice, in regard to America, to mention that England has benefited by her example, and that the large classes of frigates now employed in the British service are modeled after those of the United States." Finally, in summing up the results of the war of 1812, the London Times of Dec. 20, 1814, said:

We have retired from the combat with the stripes yet bleeding on our backs. Even yet, however, if we could but close the war, we should be proud to say that the reputation of our maritime greatness might be partially restored. But to say that it has not suffered in the estimation of all Europe, and what is more, of America herself, is to be a little more than to boast a victory over the British flag; scarcely one British ship in thirty or forty that has been captured in a desperate battle, and the most powerful navy in the world, we retire from the contest when the balance of defeat is so heavy against us.

And this was written before the Times had yet heard of the capture of two British frigates by the old Constitution, or of the disabling of the Endymion by the President and three or four other American frigates.

In view of these facts it is not surprising that Great Britain is willing to learn from the American navy. In 1898 an English naval expert, speaking of the British battleship Goliath, said: "It is of historic interest that the modern ironclad, with its turrets and massive plates, had its root idea in the famous monitors first designed for the United States government by Ericsson, who sought to combine invulnerability with heavy ordnance." Great Britain now has a great ironclad navy, but she got the idea from the United States. When she comes to re-equip her defective warships she will probably again learn a lesson from the only nation that has ever whipped and humbled her on the sea.

ber \$22 a thousand feet. Public meetings were held denouncing the impotence of the British navy to protect commerce. At one of these meetings an address was unanimously adopted declaring that "the audacity with which American privateers have approached our coasts, and the success with which their enterprise has been attended, have proved injurious to our commerce, humbling to our pride and discredit to the directors of the naval power of the British nation, whose flag till of late waved over every sea and triumphed over every rival." Every reader of history is familiar with the American naval victories in the year of 1812. In announcing one of them the London Times said: "The fact seems to be but too clearly established that the Americans have some superior mode of firing, and that we cannot be too anxiously employed in discerning to what circumstance that superiority is owing." Before the war of 1812 ended the British had adopted some important features of American shipbuilding and armament. In the introduction to a "History of the British Navy," published in 1828, the author, an Englishman, said: "It is but justice, in regard to America, to mention that England has benefited by her example, and that the large classes of frigates now employed in the British service are modeled after those of the United States." Finally, in summing up the results of the war of 1812, the London Times of Dec. 20, 1814, said:

We have retired from the combat with the stripes yet bleeding on our backs. Even yet, however, if we could but close the war, we should be proud to say that the reputation of our maritime greatness might be partially restored. But to say that it has not suffered in the estimation of all Europe, and what is more, of America herself, is to be a little more than to boast a victory over the British flag; scarcely one British ship in thirty or forty that has been captured in a desperate battle, and the most powerful navy in the world, we retire from the contest when the balance of defeat is so heavy against us.

And this was written before the Times had yet heard of the capture of two British frigates by the old Constitution, or of the disabling of the Endymion by the President and three or four other American frigates.

In view of these facts it is not surprising that Great Britain is willing to learn from the American navy. In 1898 an English naval expert, speaking of the British battleship Goliath, said: "It is of historic interest that the modern ironclad, with its turrets and massive plates, had its root idea in the famous monitors first designed for the United States government by Ericsson, who sought to combine invulnerability with heavy ordnance." Great Britain now has a great ironclad navy, but she got the idea from the United States. When she comes to re-equip her defective warships she will probably again learn a lesson from the only nation that has ever whipped and humbled her on the sea.

THE DISCHARGED POLICEMEN.

The decision of the Board of Public Safety regarding the discharged policemen is in keeping with the whole Taggart regime. Finding themselves beaten on the law points and exposed in a flagrant violation of the charter by making arbitrary removals without trial or assigning cause, the board now proposes to renege the discharged men and then suspend them pending their trial on charges regularly preferred. This is a tricky proceeding, and therefore characteristic of Taggart methods; but it is a victory for the charter, in that it is a concession that the former action of the board was illegal. A careful reading of the charter would have shown the board the right course to pursue in the first instance, but it was acting under the mayor's orders, and probably thought its violation of the charter would be allowed to pass. If the present proceeding accomplishes nothing more it has at least called public attention to the provisions of the charter in regard to the police and fire forces and has compelled one of the mayor's subservient boards to back down. Hereafter the charter will not be treated as a dead letter.

If the charges filed against the twenty-one discharged policemen are even partly true, they are a bad lot, and as they could not have become so bad in a little while, the public will wonder why they were ever appointed, or, having been appointed at intervals during several years, why the dismissals were postponed so long instead of being made promptly, from time to time, as the facts in individual cases became known. The answer is obvious. These men were all appointed for political reasons or on the strength of political pulls, with little or no reference to fitness, and after the usefulness of some of them became known they were retained for a considerable length of time for the same reasons. In other words, if the present charges are true, the spirit of the charter and public interests were ignored in the original appointments and for a good while afterward. Moreover, as the successors of the men thus arbitrarily dismissed were selected and appointed on the same grounds as the discharged men, what assurance has the public that the force has been improved? The whole proceeding goes far to justify an investigation of the board by the Council, and the public might be the gainer if a few more of the mayor's tracks could be uncovered.

A little less than five years ago the late Senator Goebel shot and killed Col. John L. Sanford. Standing by the coffin of the dead man, Joseph C. S. Blackburn said: "John Sanford was to me like a brother. I loved him. I hope God may spare me, and I shall make it my life's mission to avenge him by burying his slayer in the depths of merited public execration."

One day last week the same Blackburn stood by the grave of another man who was the victim of an assassination, and gave utterance to the following:

Build over his grave a mighty towering granite shaft that shall defy the corroding touch of time. Inscribe upon it an epitaph that shall be worthy of the man who died for his country. In life and death he was consecrated to the people's cause. He lived an honest life, and gave his life for your deliverance. Of him no eulogy but truth may say: "Earth never pillowed upon her bosom a truer son, nor heaven opened wide her portals to receive a manlier spirit."

The man to whom Mr. Blackburn applied the foregoing eulogy was the same man who, five years ago, he would bury "in the depths of merited public execration."

Tribute to "Dick" Thompson.

Richard W. Thompson, of Indiana—"Uncle Dick" Thompson, as he was generally known in political circles, was a leading and sectional figure in Western politics in the generation antedating the civil war, and his magnetic stump oratory, inexhaus-

ible fund of droll stories and tireless habit of conviviality rendered him immensely popular among the plain people of what was then the farthest boundary of civilized settlement in the growing West. His death yesterday, at the ripe age of ninety-one (within a week of the death of "Erving" Key, of the Hayes Cabinet), has removed a warrior not likely to be duplicated here under modern social conditions. "Uncle Dick" was a politician of the genuine old-fashioned type that perished in the flames of civil strife. He was ill at ease in the official family of the late Mr. Hayes, and still more so in the family of Mr. Cleveland, when acting as the honest American representative of the swindling French Panama canal ring. Peace to his ashes!

BUBBLES IN THE AIR.

The Pulpit Braces Up in Kentucky.
"Is your clergyman in good health?"
"No, poor man; every time he preaches a sermon he has to have a toddy."

War Notes.

"Great suspense and excitement in London."

"London, England, or London, Ky.?"

As She Understood It.

He—This liquid air is great!
She—Yes; would it be lovely when we can dip up hot or cold air with a bucket and pour it out of the window?

Less Wearing Where He Is.

"Pettigrew will be out of Congress next year."

"Don't rejoice over that; he may get his friends to urge him to go spouting around all over the country."

News for H. Thurston Peck.

"Professor Peck rises to ask who reads 'Ben-Hur' nowadays?"

"H'm, as he lives in New York city he probably doesn't start to read it. He has been in his twelfth highly successful week on the New York stage."

Valentines.

Briton to Boer—
The fray is done, the war is o'er,
When you give up and shoot no more.

Boer to Briton—
The fight is off, we'll go back home,
When you retreat across the foam.

GEN. BULLER'S FAILURES.

Does General Buller know precisely where he is "at"?—Boston Globe.
They ought to start a ferry to and fro on the Tugela—Boston Herald.
General Buller's key to Ladysmith doesn't seem to fit the lock—Kansas City Star.
Everything that Buller grabs appears to be painfully hot—Cleveland Plain Dealer.
The Boers have a way of not fighting until they are ready, and then they are out of sight—St. Louis Post-Dispatch.
Somehow, when the English have taken a kope with hard fighting, they nearly always reach the conclusion that it isn't the one they wanted, and abandon it—Baltimore Herald.

General Buller's campaign has signally demonstrated the futility of both direct assaults upon strong outposts and attempts to force them by tardy flank movements.—New York Herald.

"Ours River to Cross" was a favorite song with our soldiers in the Spanish war, but it probably would make no appeal to Buller's men on the wrong side of the Tugela.—St. Louis Republic.

General Buller will find probably that this thing of running a wedge into the enemy and getting it peppered from both sides and in front is a highly spiced maneuver.—Memphis Commercial Appeal.

Some people blame Buller because he prophesied a victory and then doesn't have it. The fact is, however, that a general never tells the truth beforehand about what he is going to do.—Pittsburg Press.

The British dispatches explaining Buller's "diversion" remind one of the explanation made by McCellan's friends that military strategy was substantially wearing army shoes with the heels in front.—Buffalo Commercial.

Ladysmith, apparently, is to be abandoned to fate. It is a bitter pill to swallow, but Gen. Sir George White submits to the calamity in the full knowledge that he and his comrades have done their duty to the last.—Pittsburg Chronicle Telegraph.

General Buller cannot be accused of either cowardice or lack of initiative. He has made three attempts to get to the relief of the garrison, and has fought bravely, bravely and bravely. But his task was beyond him.—Rochester Post-Express.

This new reverse must be exceedingly depressing to the British troops. The key to the road to Ladysmith remains in the possession of the Boers, and the conditions that they are attempting a hopeless task is probably now shared by Buller's forces, as it has already long been feared by English military critics.—Chicago News.

Man of Good Sense.

Washington Post.
We are at a loss to understand why Mr. Sewall should be scolded because of his disinclination to make another political speech on the ticket for Governor. It may be heaps of fun for the talking end of a presidential ticket, but the chap who has said his way and kept quiet is usually satisfied with one experience.

In Business Again.

Lieutenant Totten has reopened his sign-writing establishment and offers a nice lot of end-of-the-world signs for the spring trade.

Wanamaker's Way.

Washington Post.
Every time something unpleasant happens in Philadelphia Editor Wanamaker illustrates the event with a picture of Mr. Quay.

Why She Is Single.

Washington Post.
It is not altogether strange that Miss Helen Gould should regard one son-in-law in the family as a sufficiency.

Come, Come!

Philadelphia Times.
St. Valentine's day was famous formerly as the date on which most of the letter carriers used to get loaded.

Lincoln.

The hour was on us, where the man? The fatal snuff was unflinching. And up the way of tears He came into the years.

Our pastoral captain, Fort he came As one that answers to his name; The crowned howl and whistled, His work how fair and large—

To set the stones back in the wall The divided house about, And peace from him about, Hope and the childlike heart.

We looked on him, "Thy be," we said, "Come crowns and laurels, The shepherd who will keep The flock from harm and loss."

Unhappily, yes; yet 'twas the man Presaging the immortal scene, Some battle of his wars Who swam the childlike heart.

Not he would tramp to an small head From the battle of the dead, Time's mighty vintage cup, And drink all honor up.

No flutter of the banners bold, No surge by the lucky word, The haughty conquerors, The victors of the world, He came into the years.

Not his bare, their pageantry, Their goal, their glory was not his; The crown of thorns and crown, The crown, to fold the sheep.

The need comes not without the man; The need comes not without the man; The need comes not without the man; The need comes not without the man.

Our pastoral captain, skilled to crook And lead the flock, the flock, The flock, the flock, The flock, the flock.

Not his bare, their pageantry, Their goal, their glory was not his; The crown of thorns and crown, The crown, to fold the sheep.

The need comes not without the man; The need comes not without the man; The need comes not without the man; The need comes not without the man.

Our pastoral captain, skilled to crook And lead the flock, the flock, The flock, the flock, The flock, the flock.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

The Diurnal Theory of the Earth, Mr. Andrews's Extraordinary Book.

This large and closely printed volume of 550 pages is an exposition of a new theory of terrestrial motion which the discoverer and author, now deceased, called the diurnal motion of the earth. This must not be confounded with the diurnal motion of the earth, that is its daily revolution on its axis, nor with its movements in its orbit around the sun, nor with any other motion of the earth heretofore recognized by scientists. The term diurnal motion is used to denote what is claimed to be a spiral or corkscrew-like motion of the solid crust of the earth, moving as would the skin of an orange, were it twisted spirally, independently of the pulp. The author's theory and his claimed discovery is that the interior of the earth is a liquid mass incased in a crust which, with a ceaseless and eternal motion, slips spirally in such a way that the north pole is continually moving south, the south pole continually moving north, and every part of the earth's surface, at intervals of many millions of years, is brought successively under tropical and polar influences. Not the least remarkable thing about the book is the personality of the author, William Andrews, born at Philadelphia in 1798, served as a drummer-boy in the war of 1812, learned the trade of a bookbinder and settled in Cumberland, Md. Without early educational advantages he became a great student of science, especially of geology. During his life he collected a very large natural history museum, and it was after his death, was purchased by the State of New York, another part by a Maryland college and a third by the Maryland Academy of Sciences. While carrying on his business as a bookbinder and stationer he corresponded with leading geologists of the world over. He died at Cumberland in 1887, two years after the publication of his book, and demonstrating his theory of "The Diurnal Motion of the Earth," and left the book to be published after his death. That he was an original thinker and laborious investigator even a cursory examination of this work shows. It is devoid of imagination or sentiment as a demonstration in mathematics. There is no attempt at fine writing or oratory. It is simply the earnest effort of a deep thinker and sincere convert to a theory to present it in such a way as to convince others. The author shows a familiarity with every phase of terrestrial philosophy, of geological science, and with the works of the great modern scientists. He does not antagonize any of them, but advances his own theory as to the missing link that harmonizes and reconciles all. He claims that while his theory does not conflict with any of the established conclusions of geologists, it explains the diurnal motion of the earth, and the annual motion of the earth around the sun and its daily motion on its axis, the crust of the earth moves spirally from the south pole towards the north pole, accomplishing one diurnal revolution of the earth approximately every 8,000,000 years; the glacial period of geological history, which is now passing, is a continuous effect of the spiral movement of the crust of the earth; hence, all parts of the earth's surface are successively subjected to the influence of the glacial period; hence, the present polar regions will eventually be lowered by the glacial revolution towards the equator, and the present temperate regions of the earth will be twisted into the polar atmosphere, and become ice-locked; this diurnal motion of the earth is the cause of all its other motions. What may be called the plan of rotations as supported by existing geological evidence may be stated as follows: Two hundred and ten million years ago that part of the southern ocean in which the South American continent was situated was, by the spiral revolution of the earth, made to pass under southern polar regions, and the present southern polar region now